

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

ANDREW ALLAM, SR.,

Plaintiff,

v.

SUPERINTENDENT MCGINLEY *and*
GEORGE LITTLE,

Defendants.

No. 1:20-CV-00933

(Chief Judge Brann)

(Magistrate Judge Schwab)

ORDER

MARCH 31, 2022

Plaintiff Andrew Allam, Sr. filed the instant action on June 9, 2020, and it was jointly assigned to the undersigned and to Magistrate Judge Susan E. Schwab. Upon designation, a magistrate judge may “conduct hearings, including evidentiary hearings, and . . . submit to a judge of the court proposed findings of fact and recommendations.”¹ Once filed, this report and recommendation is disseminated to the parties in the case who then have the opportunity to file written objections.²

On February 25, 2022 Magistrate Judge Schwab issued a thorough report and recommendation recommending that the Court deny Allam’s motion for a preliminary injunction.³

¹ 28 U.S.C. 636(b)(1)(B).

² 28 U.S.C. 636(b)(1).

³ Doc. 38 (citing Doc. 34).

No objections to the report and recommendation have been filed. When no objection is made to a report and recommendation, this Court will review the recommendation only for clear error.⁴ Regardless of whether timely objections are made, district courts may accept, reject, or modify—in whole or in part—the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.⁵

Because the Court writes solely for the parties, it will not restate the facts, but will instead adopt the recitation of facts as set forth by Magistrate Judge Schwab.⁶ The Court has conducted a de novo review here and found no error.

AND NOW, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Magistrate Judge Schwab’s Report and Recommendation (Doc. 38) is **ADOPTED** in full; and
2. Allam’s motion for a preliminary injunction (Doc. 34) is **DENIED**.

BY THE COURT:

s/ Matthew W. Brann

Matthew W. Brann
Chief United States District Judge

⁴ Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), advisory committee notes; *see also Snyder v. Bender*, 548 F. App’x 767, 771 (3d Cir. 2013) (noting that district courts need not conduct *de novo* review of portions of recommendation to which no party files specific objections).

⁵ *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Local Rule 72.31; *Henderson v. Carlson*, 812 F.2d 874, 878 (3d Cir. 1987) (explaining that court should in some manner review recommendations regardless of whether objections were filed).

⁶ *See* Doc. 38 at 1–3.